

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES §
LIMITED, LLC §
§ v. § CASE NO. 6:12-cv-200
§

ACER INC and ACER AMERICA §
CORPORATION §

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES §
LIMITED, LLC §
§ v. § CASE NO. 6:12-cv-201
§

BROTHER INDUSTRIES LTD and §
BROTHER INTERNATIONAL §
CORPORATION §

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES §
LIMITED §
§ v. § CASE NO. 6:12-cv-202
§

CANON, INC. and CANON U.S.A., INC §
§

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES §
LIMITED §
§ v. § CASE NO. 6:12-cv-203
§

DANE ELEC CORP. USA and DANE §
ELEC MEMORY §

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-204

DELL, INC.

§

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-205

**FALCON NORTHWEST COMPUTER
SYSTEMS, INC.**

§

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-206

**FUJITSU LIMITED and FUJITSU
AMERICA, INC.**

§

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-207

**HITI DIGITAL, INC. and HITI
DIGITAL AMERICA, INC.**

§

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-208

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

§

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED	§	
v.	§	CASE NO. 6:12-cv-209
JASCO PRODUCTS COMPANY	§	
	§	
<hr/>		
TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED	§	
v.	§	CASE NO. 6:12-cv-210
KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY CO., INC	§	
	§	
<hr/>		
TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED	§	
v.	§	CASE NO. 6:12-cv-211
LEXAR MEDIA, INC. and MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.	§	
	§	
<hr/>		
TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED	§	
v.	§	CASE NO. 6:12-cv-212
MICRODIA LIMITED	§	
	§	
<hr/>		
TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED	§	
v.	§	CASE NO. 6:12-cv-213
NEWEGG INC and ROSEWILL INC.	§	
	§	
<hr/>		

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED, LLC**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-214

SABRENT

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED, LLC**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-215

**SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD.
and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS USA,
INC.**

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED, LLC**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-216

**SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION and
EPSON AMERICA, INC.**

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED, LLC**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-217

**SHUTTLE, INC. and SHUTTLE
COMPUTER GROUP, INC.**

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES
LIMITED, LLC**

v.

CASE NO. 6:12-cv-218

SYSTEMAX, INC.

ORDER

Plaintiff recently filed a series of related cases (listed above). The Court will hold a joint scheduling conference in these cases. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to file a notice of readiness for scheduling conference when all Defendants in **all of the listed cases** have either answered or filed a motion to transfer or dismiss.¹ The notice must be filed simultaneously in each case within five days of the last remaining Defendant's answer or motion. The notice must include a list of any pending motions to dismiss or transfer and a list of any other related cases filed in the Eastern District of Texas involving the same patent(s).

If the cases are not ready for scheduling conference within ninety (90) days of this order, Plaintiff must file a detailed status report explaining the reason for the delay.

It is SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 11th day of April, 2012.



MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff should not delay filing the notice because of later-filed, related cases.